



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/714,635

11/18/2003

Tomer Shiran

1261-US

3270

7590  
Tomer Shiran  
18 Martin Buber St.  
Haifa, 34861  
ISRAEL

03/12/2008

EXAMINER

OBEID, FAHD A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/714,635	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHIRAN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> FAHD A. OBEID	<b>Art Unit</b> 3627	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                      |                                                                   |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____                                                          | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of the Application***

1. **Claims 1-13** are pending in this application.
1. This is in reply to application filed on 01/02/2008.
2. Claims 1 and 6 has been amended.
3. Claims 1-13 are currently pending and have been examined.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

**4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matos (US 2003/0036930) in view of Buchsbaum (US 7,051,074).**

1. Regarding Claims 1 and 6: Matos discloses a method for prefetching travel information relevant to travel products from travel suppliers in anticipation of future requests from users, wherein the travel information is stored in a cache, the method comprising:

- Determining the set of travel suppliers that need to be queried (figs 6, 10, 12-14, and pages 6-7 para 54).

Performing the following for each travel supplier:

- Making a connection to that travel supplier (figs 6-10 and page 1 para 2-3).

Performing the following for each query that is needed:

- Sending the query to the supplier and retrieving the results (figs 6-10, page 5 para 48, and claim 1).
- Storing the results in the cache, and terminating said connection to the supplier (pages 4-5 para 41 & 45).

Matos does not expressly disclose a prefetcher for retrieving travel information.

However, Buchsbaum discloses the following:

- . Determining what queries need to be sent to the supplier, based on the protocol that is defined by the specific supplier and the travel information that is expected to be most relevant to future requests from users (col 1 lines 59-64, col 4 lines 20-35, col 5 lines 21-29, and col 8 lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Buchsbaum's teachings in Matos's creating travel packages system enabled, for the advantage of maintaining prefetched information for a user and predicting websites which a user will visit in the future (Buchsbaum; col 5 lines 21-22, and col 8 lines 60-61).

5. Regarding Claim 2: Matos discloses system according to claim 1, wherein said front-end is embodied as a Web site (figs 12-14 and page 1 para 3).

6. Regarding Claim 3: Matos discloses according to claim 1, further comprising an optimizer to perform post-processing on the prefetched data (page 4 para 35).

7. Regarding Claims 4 and 10: Matos discloses system according to claim 1, wherein said system serves one or more organizations, and said users are members of

said organizations (users such as agents where agents are the online computer reservation system; see fig 13 and page 1 para 6).

8. Regarding Claims 5 and 11: Matos discloses system according to claim 1, wherein said users are travel agents that use said system to serve their customers (travel agents such as online computer reservation system; see fig 13 and page 1 para 6).

9. Regarding Claim 7: Matos discloses a method according to claim 6, wherein the specific type of product is one of the following: rental cars; accommodations; and air travel (fig 2 and claims 2-4).

10. Regarding Claim 8: Matos discloses a method according to claim 6, wherein said protocol is based on Web services, and wherein said queries are messages that are sent to the supplier, and wherein said results are messages sent by the supplier (pages 4-5 para 41, and page 5 para 45).

11. Regarding Claim 9: Matos discloses a method according to claim 6, wherein storing involves substantial processing before said storing (pages 4-5 para 38, 41 & 45).

12. Regarding Claim 12: Matos discloses a method according to claim 6, wherein said travel supplier is a Global Distribution System (GDS) that supplies information for travel products from different suppliers (Travel Server; fig 2, page 6 para 49-54).

**13. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matos (US 2003/0036930) in view of Buchsbaum (US 7,051,074) as applied to claims 1-12 above, and further in view of Schiff (US 2002/0082877).**

14. Regarding Claim 13: Matos does not expressly disclose a history of travel reservation.

However Schiff does disclose a method according to claim 6, wherein determining what queries need to be sent involves inspecting the history of travel reservations of said users (page 7 para 75 & 80, and page 9 para 98-99).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Schiff's teachings in Matos's creating travel packages system enabled, for which information may aid the user guiding the customer through the remainder of the pre qualification process. This information may include a summary relating to previous cruises or other vacations booked or taken by the customer, and notes or reminders used to record items of interest which may be

useful in distinguishing a particular customer or his travel habits (Schiff page 9 para 98).

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 5 and 11 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In particular the applicant argues that: travel agent using the system.

In response to the argument, examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant is reminded that claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation. Matos teaches a customer using a computer connected to the travel service via the internet, can purchase items from a dynamically changing inventory including airline tickets, bus tickets, ferry tickets, lodgings, etc., for rentals, attractions and combinations thereof; such a travel service cooperates with a centralized computer reservation system that communicates with travel agents for the purpose of providing up-to-date fare; (see para 6)

Therefore, Matos still meets the scope of the limitation as currently claimed.

15. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.



16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FAHD A. OBEID whose telephone number is (571)270-3324. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fahd Obeid  
Patent Examiner  
02/24/2008

/F. Ryan Zeender/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 3627